



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,450	09/09/2003	Richard Martin	14189US02	4742
23446 7590 07/18/2008 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER KIM, WESLEY LEO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,450

Applicant(s)

MARTIN ET AL.

Examiner

WESLEY L. KIM

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed 4/22/08. Claims 1-25 are pending in the current Office Action. This Action is made FINAL.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/22/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Office Action has been modified to clarify the examiners position in view of the Applicants objections to the applied art. The examiner would also like to note that prior art must be considered in its entirety.

- Applicant argues that Gai does not teach "determining at least one available switch port having a capability to handle first local area network".

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Gai clearly teaches determining at least one available switch port having a capability to handle a first local area network (Column 7, Lines 20-30 and Column 5, Lines 20-47, since the active port has failed and is no longer capable of handling a first local network, an available backup port having capability to handle the first local area network is determined), said first local area network having a first default switch port (Column 11, Lines 8-15 and Column 5, Lines 20-24, the original active port (i.e. default port) initially selected based on least cost (Column 2, Lines 53-56) is the default port). It is clear that the cited portions of the reference teach "determining at least one available switch port having

Art Unit: 2617

capability...”, because the selected port has the capability to handle sourcing and sinking of data.

- Applicant argues that the fact that a LAN “may source or sink data frames to one another or to the servers” does not imply “a capability to handle a first area network”.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. See Column 1, Lines 20-35 of Gai et al.

- Applicant argues that Juitt does not support WLAN comprising a group of access points.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. See Fig.7 and Par.23, Lines 13-21, it is clear that the access point group (Fig.7,102a-102c) are a group of access points supported by the WLAN.

- Applicant argues that Juitts gateway servers are not connected to access points.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The Gateway servers are connected to access point groups (Fig.7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gai et al (U.S. 6032194) in view of Eglin (U.S. 2004/0047320) and Juitt et al (U.S. 2006/0234678).

Regarding Claims 1, 9, and 17, Gai et al. discloses a method, machine readable storing having stored thereon a computer program having at least one code section for performing the method, and a system for access point aggregation and resiliency in a local area network (Abstract; Column 5, Lines 16-19 and 35-53), the method comprising: determining at least one available switch port having a capability to handle a first local area network (Column 7, Lines 20-30 and Column 5, Lines 20-47, since the active port has failed and is no longer capable of handling a first local network, an available backup port having capability to handle the first local area network is determined), said first local area network having a first default switch port (Column 11, Lines 8-15 and Column 5, Lines 20-24, the original active port (i.e. default port) initially selected based on least cost (Column 2, Lines 53-56) is the default port); provisioning said at least one available switch port to provide service to said first local area network (Column 12, Lines 19-27 and Column 5, Lines 44-47, the backup port is the at least one available switch port); and communicating information using at least one of said first default switch port and said at least one provisioned switch port (Column 12, Lines 19-27 and Column 5, Lines 44-47, the backup port is the at least one available switch port).

However, Gai et al. discloses this network resiliency with port reconfiguration employed over a wired local area network, containing a number of hosts or end stations which are not described, connected to a switch, while failing to specifically disclose a hybrid wired/wireless local area network.

In related prior art, Eglin discloses a network which employs reconfiguration to groups of access points connected to a switch to implement connection resiliency. The network is arranged as a hybrid wired/wireless local area network by providing the wireless access points 106, 108, 110, etc. shown in Figure 1 (Page 2, Paragraphs 0036 and 0029; Page 3, Paragraphs 0030 and 0036).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Eglin with those of Gai et al. in order to employ connection protection in a wireless network which allows users to roam freely while maintaining a connection.

However, while Gai et al. as modified by Eglin discloses that a WLAN connected to a failing port can be transferred to a backup port in order to provide resiliency to the network, they fail to specifically disclose that the hosts, having the capability to source and sink data, which are part of the WLAN are actually a group of access points.

In related prior art, Juitt et al. discloses a method for managing data traffic in wireless networks wherein a WLAN comprising a group of access points is connected to a port which can be transferred if a fault occurs (Figure 7 and Paragraph 0023, Lines 13-21).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Juitt et al. with those of Gai et al. as modified by Eglin in order to show that a WLAN can contain multiple

access points and that it is desirable to provide continuous communications to the entire network in the event of a port, to which the WLAN is connected, failing.

Regarding Claims 2, 10, and 18, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses that the determining further comprises selecting said at least one available switch port from a reserved pool of available switch ports (Figure 3D, Column 11, Lines 41-52; Column 12, Lines 13-27 and 37-42 and 46-55).

Regarding Claims 3, 11, and 19, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses returning said selected at least one available switch port to said reserved pool of available switch ports upon abatement of a need to utilize said provisioned at least one available switch port (Figure 3E, Column 14, Lines 37-48).

Regarding Claims 4, 12, and 20, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses selecting said at least one available switch port from at least one of a first switching element and a second switching element, said first default switch port being associated with said first switching element (the different ports of the access switch are connected to different backbone switches, additionally some local area networks can communicate directly with more than one switch - Column 10, Lines 49-67; Column 11, Lines 1-7 and 8-24 and 41-51, " Column 12, Lines 19-27).

Regarding Claims 5, 13, and 21, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses determining at least one a second available

switch port having a capability to handle a second access point group, said second access point group having a second default switch port (the same procedure is followed for each local area network connected to the switch for determining a transmission port - Column 7, Lines 20-30; Column 10, Lines 49-67; Column 11, Lines 1-15).

Regarding Claims 6, 14, and 22, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses provisioning at least a third available switch port to provide service to said second access point group (Column 10, Lines 1-12; Column 11, Lines 8-24 and 41-51," Column 12, Lines 19-27).

Regarding Claims 7, 15, and 23, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses switching between any two of said at least one available switch port, said at least a second available switch port and said at least a third available switch port (Column 11, Lines 8-24 and 41-51, Column 12, Lines 19-27 and 32-42).

Regarding Claims 8, 16, and 24, as applied above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin and Juitt et al. further discloses switching between said default switch port and said at least one available switch port in a time period less than on the order of a few milliseconds from at least one of a detectable link failure and a configuration change (change occurs at or about the same instant, and the connection is tested every few milliseconds- Column 12, Lines 4-12; Column 14, Lines 40-51).

Regarding Claim 25, as applied to claim 17 above, Gai et al. as modified by Eglin further discloses that said at least one processor is at least one of a switch

processor, a bandwidth management controller, a quality of service controller, a load balancing controller, a session controller, and a network management controller
(Column 10, Lines 1-12; Column 11, Lines 8- 24 and 41-51; Column 12, Lines 19- 27).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WESLEY L. KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-7867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

WLK
/Wesley L Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617